**Pending Claims** 

Claims 1 and 4-46 are pending. Claims 2-3 are canceled. Claims 23-44 are withdrawn

from consideration. Claims 1 and 45 are amended. Claim 46 has been added. The Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the claim amendments and

arguments presented herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as Being Anticipated by Haag:

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-10, 12-16, 18, 22 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,093,293 to Haag et al. (hereinafter "Haag").

Independent Claim 1

The Office Action states that Haag teaches a magnetron sputtering source that includes

all the elements of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an I-

PVD source that includes a plurality of anode sections that are concentrically positioned in the

chamber. Independent claim 1 has also been amended to recite a segmented magnetron cathode

comprising a plurality of concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segments that are

positioned in the chamber proximate to the concentrically positioned anode sections so that a

respective one of the plurality of anode sections is positioned adjacent to a respective one of the

plurality of magnetron cathode segments, where each of the plurality of concentrically

positioned magnetron cathode segments is electrically isolated from each of the other

concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segments.

U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 10

Haag describes a magnetron sputtering source that has at least two mutually isolated

stationary bar-shaped target arrangements mounted one alongside the other and separated by

respective slits. Each target includes a respective electric pad so that it can be operated

independently from the other target arrangement. The magnet arrangement can be controlled

independently from each other.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach every aspect of

the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught by the

reference must be inherently present in the reference. Thus, a claim is anticipated by a reference

only if each and every element of the claim is described, either expressly or inherently, in a

single prior art reference.

Independent claim 1 as currently amended recites an I-PVD source with a concentric

geometry. Claim 1 requires that the plurality of anode sections be concentrically positioned in

the chamber. Also, claim 1 recites a segmented magnetron cathode comprising a plurality of

concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segments that are positioned in the chamber

proximate to the concentrically positioned anode sections so that a respective one of the plurality

of anode sections is positioned adjacent to a respective one of the plurality of magnetron cathode

segments.

The concentric anode and cathode geometry recited in independent claim 1 can provide a

much more uniform coating on a substrate at a given level of plasma density than the bar-shaped

target arrangements described in Haag because bar-shaped target arrangements have non-

uniform magnetic fields at the edges of the bars. See, for example, Haag, FIG. 8 where the bar-

U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 11

shaped target material is perpendicular to the longest dimension of the substrate holder 66. In

such bar-shape target geometries, the film thickness distribution on the substrate under the edge

of the bars is less than the film thickness distribution on the substrate under the middle of the

bars. When electrical power on the bar-shaped magnetron is varied in order to increase or

reduce the deposition rate, the changes in the deposition rate on the substrate under the center of

the bar and on the substrate under the edge of the bar are different due to the different geometry

of the magnetic fields. Haag shows apparatus with bar-shaped targets that are much longer than

the substrate in order to compensate for edge effects.

In contrast, the I-PVD source with the concentric geometry claimed in independent claim

1 can separately control of the film thickness on the substrate under the center of the

concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segments relative to the film thickness under the

edges of the concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segments. Consequently, with this

concentric design, the magnetron size can be equal to the size of the substrate, which reduces the

cost and size of the apparatus.

The Office Action states, in connection with the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 3,

that Haag fails to disclose a concentric orientation of the cathode and the anode. However, the

Office Action states that U.S. Patent No. 5,135,554 to Rogers (hereinafter "Rogers") teaches an

apparatus and method for sputtering wherein cathodes are located central to the workpiece. The

Office Action refers to the cathodes 48, 50, and 52 in Rogers FIG. 3 and argues that it would be

obvious for the anodes and cathodes of Haag to have the common central orientation taught by

Rogers and that such an orientation is a matter of design choice.

U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 12

The Applicant submits that Rogers does not teach the concentric geometry claimed in

independent claim 1. In fact, the Office Action refers to a geometry with three separate

conventional sputtering units 48, 50, and 52 that are located radially around the center of the

chamber. Positioning separate and complete magnetrons around the center of a chamber in a

radial geometry is not equivalent to a single magnetron with a concentric anode and cathode

geometry. The Applicant submits that it is not a matter of design choice. Rather it is a different

design that achieved different process goals.

Because the sputtering units 48, 50, and 52 are separate, but complete magnetrons, they

do not have the capabilities of the claimed I-PVD source. For example, the user cannot

independently control electrically isolated sections of the anode and cathode. Therefore, there is

much less control over the uniformity of the resulting sputtered film. More specifically, the

Rogers sputtering system does not include a plurality of concentrically positioned magnetron

cathode segments that are positioned in the chamber proximate to the concentrically positioned

anode sections so that a respective one of the plurality of anode sections is positioned adjacent to

a respective one of the plurality of magnetron cathode segments.

In addition, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an I-PVD source that

includes a power supply that ignites and sustains a plasma comprising metal ions. None of the

prior art references of record alone, or in combination, describes using the geometry recited in

independent claim 1 as currently amended to ignite and sustain a plasma comprising metal ions

from the concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segment material and the feed gas.

U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 13

In light of the above arguments and amendment to independent claim 1, the Applicant

submits that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. In addition, the Applicant submits

that dependent claims 4-22 are allowable as depending on an allowable base claim.

Independent Claim 45

Independent claim 45 has been amended to recite a plasma I-PVD source comprising a

concentrically positioned segmented magnetron cathode that generates a plasma comprising

metal ions from the concentrically positioned magnetron cathode segment material and the feed

gas. As described in connection with rejection of claim 1, Rogers does not teach the claimed

concentric cathode geometry. Also, none of the prior art references of record alone, or in

combination, describes using the geometry recited in independent claim 1 as currently amended

to ignite and sustain a plasma comprising metal ions. Thus, the Applicant submits that claim 45

is allowable over the prior art of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag in

view of Roger. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag in

view of U.S. Patent No. 4,132,961 to Bergman. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Haag in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,616,225 to Sieck et al. Claim 8 is

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag. Claim 11 is rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag in view of U.S. Patent Publication U.S.

2002/0157964 to Hoffman. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Haag in view of U.S. Patent Publication US 2001/0050225 to Glocker. Claims 19-20 are

U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 14

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag in view of U.S. Patent No.

3,609,658. Also, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag

in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,425 to Rhodes.

Claim 3 has been canceled. In light of the amendments to independent claim 1 and the

above arguments made in connection with the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Applicant

submits that dependent claims 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 19-20, and 21 are allowable as depending from

an allowable base claim.

**New Claims** 

New claim 46 recites the plasma source of claim 1 wherein at least two of the plurality of

magnetron cathode segments has an unbalance magnetic field that increases a density of the

plasma and a density of the metal ions in the plasma. Claim 46 is supported by the originally

filed specification. See, for example, FIG. 2C and paragraph 38, 49, and 56-61 of the published

application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-46 are pending. Claims 1 and 45 have been amended. Claim 46 has been

added. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the

above arguments. The undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any

outstanding issues, and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition

for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Amendment and Response U.S.S.N.: 10/710,946

Attorney Docket No.: ZON-015

Page 15

Date: December 24, 2008

Reg. No. 40,137

Tel. No.: (781) 271-1503 Fax No.: (781) 271-1527

Doc. 3589v1

/Kurt Rauschenbach/
Kurt Rauschenbach, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicant
Rauschenbach Patent Law Group, LLC
Post Office Box 387

Bedford, MA 01730